THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII MARCH, 1954 No. 405

Editorial

WE are likely to hear a great deal this year about "Christian Hope", since the theme of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held at Evanston in August is: "Christ—The Hope of the World".[1] For some years Christian scholars and men of affairs from various countries have been preparing the ground in a number of Commissions which will report to the Assembly.

At least two books on the subject of hope by Anglican theologians have already been published this year: *The Meaning of Hope: a biblical exposition with concordance* by Professor C. F. D. Moule (Highway Press, 3s. 6d.), and *The Christian Hope: the presence and the parousia* by Canon J. E. Fison (Longmans, 21s.). Prof. Moule's little book is based on Bible Readings which he gave at a C.M.S. Summer School, and all that need be said of it is that it will be welcomed as a readable and reliable text-book for both private and group study.

Canon Fison's book, on the other hand, is a major theological essay. His theme is that the Lord's parousia or final coming belongs to the centre, and not to the circumference, of the Christian faith, and that the Church will be without the living hope, which the world to-day needs more than anything else, if it does not recover this fundamental article of its faith. This is not, however, a plea for a naïve apocalypticism or millenarianism. Canon Fison is as severe on the literalistic misunderstandings of adventist sects as he is on "protestant biblicism" and "catholic ecclesiasticism", though he acknowledges the truth which each distorts. What he claims to propound is a restatement of Christian eschatology that does justice to the perspective of the New Testament and that corrects the errors into which all sections of Christendom have fallen, in one way or another, through neglecting it. For example, the "realized eschatology", to which British theologians are nowadays so partial, cuts "the nerve of the theological virtue of hope". Though it rightly grasps the real presence of the Kingdom of God, it leaves "us with no eschatological expectation in a situation in which everything that really matters has happened already". "Convinced of the present presence it ignores the future parousia."

It seems doubtful whether Canon Fison's criticisms of Dr Dodd are warranted: see e.g. Dodd's *The Coming of Christ*, to which Fison does not refer. In fact, we should say that the value of Fison's book is the lively and imaginative way in which it drives home some of the

[1] For an authoritative account of the plans for this Assembly see R. H. Hyslop, *Together to be his Witnesses*, published by the Study Department of the World Council of Churches, 1s.

implications of what is loosely called "realized eschatology", especially the expectation of the future consummation which is implicit in it. No one, it is to be hoped, will swallow this book whole, but no one is likely to read it without having new lines of thought opened up and congenial assumptions wholesomely challenged. Particularly suggestive are Canon Fison's emphasis on the element of surprise that there must be in every lovers' meeting and therefore above all in the parousia, the distinction he draws between calendar time and lovers' time, and his insistence that "true eschatology always has reference to something really present and is never merely an inference from what is really absent.

His writing has something of the quality and flavour of P. T. Forsyth. His rhetoric likewise can be at once irritating and enlightening. He himself recalls that Silvester Horne dismissed a book of Forsyth as "fireworks in a fog", and at times one wonders whether that is how Canon Fison's own book should be described. But no, there is much more than fireworks here, even if, when all is said and done, there is still plenty of fog. Prof. Moule says that Dr M. A. C. Warren has spoken of hope as "faith on tiptoe". Canon Fison is full of hope in precisely that sense; and there is consequently theological excitement in reading him. All the same, before we have finished with the subject, we shall need the help of some theologians whose feet are flat on the earth.

* * * * *

Where should the dividing line be drawn between the earlier and later writings of St Augustine? Prof. Burleigh, when called upon to edit a volume of his earlier writings for "The Library of Christian Classics",[1] decided that it should be at the beginning of his episcopate, i.e. in 395/6, though he makes an exception in the case of *De Natura Boni*, which was written in 404. The other writings translated in this volume are the following: *Soliloquia, De Magistro, De Libero Arbitrio, De Vera Religione, De Utilitate Credendi, De Fide et Symbolo,* and *De Diversis Quaestionibus.* As Prof. Burleigh says, this selection should "give an adequate representation of the working out of the system—metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, and withal Biblical, which may justly be called 'Augustinianism' ".

For the general characteristics of "The Library of Christian Classics" see THEOLOGY, July 1953, pp. 241 f. Two further Augustinian volumes will appear later in the series.

[1] *Augustine: Earlier Writings.* Selected and translated with Introductions by J. H. S. Burleigh. The Library of Christian Classics: Vol. VI. S.C.M. Press. 30s.

The Fathers and the Scriptures[1]

THE most neglected aspect of the immense corpus of writings, which the Fathers of the Church have bequeathed to us, is their exegesis of Holy Scripture. This is the more surprising, since the larger part of what they wrote consists of exegesis. This neglect can, however, readily be accounted for. Generally speaking, patristic interpretation of Scripture, and particularly of the O.T., disconcerts the modern mind by its symbolic character. Moreover, this symbolic exegesis is itself a compound of very different elements between which no clear distinction has hitherto been drawn. And there has been no really scientific way of tackling the subject.

This state of affairs is for several reasons at present changing. Interpreters of the O.T., notably those who follow Hermann Gunkel and Hugo Gressmann, have been emphasizing its eschatological aspect and the fact that it regards the events of Israel's past as figures or types of realities to come, especially in the Prophets and the Psalms. Interpreters of the N.T. on their side have been led to take more seriously its allusions to the O.T. and especially the intention of its authors to show that the eschatological realities announced by the Prophets were accomplished in Christ and in the events of his life. We need only recall here the names of Leopold Goppelt (*Typos, Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*), Sir Edwyn Hoskyns (*The Fourth Gospel*), C. K. Barrett ("The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel", *J.T.S.*, July–October 1947), and Harald Sahlin (*Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums*).

Alongside this movement which has brought the expositors of the Bible—or at least some of them—nearer to the Fathers, patristic scholars have begun a more rigorous study of the biblical commentaries and homilies of the early Christian centuries. There are now available monographs like those of Henri de Lubac on Origen, of Claude Mondésert on Clement of Alexandria, and of Maurice Pontet on St Augustine's sermons. More particularly, the study of typology in the rites of Christian worship, which was started by F. J. Dölger, has issued in Per Lundberg's admirable book, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Église*. I have myself extended this inquiry to the other sacraments in my *Bible et Liturgie*. Finally, in *Sacramentum futuri* I made a first attempt to discriminate between the elements of unequal value and of different origin which we find in the writings of the Fathers.

Thus typology had reappeared on the theological scene. I propose here briefly to indicate the lines of research that are now open, the methodological principles that are emerging, and the first results that can be registered.

I. The first thing that has to be done, as I have suggested, is to draw distinctions. Origen spoke of the *vast forest* of the Scriptures. *A fortiori* the patristic commentaries on the Bible might be so described.

[1] A paper prepared in French for the Patristic Conference at Oxford in September 1951.

One must get one's bearings in this immense world. In the first place, it is essential to distinguish between authentic typology and the various kinds of allegorism. I use these terms for the sake of convenience and because they are becoming generally accepted. It is in fact evident that the symbolic exegesis of the Fathers derives from two quite different sources. One was hellenistic culture, which had both its religious and literary aspects. We know that the philosophers —whether stoic, pythagorean, or platonist—revered the ancient mythological traditions which were handed down to them in their sacred books, but were scandalized by their literal meaning; therefore they saw in them symbols of either cosmic or spiritual realities. I need only refer to Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride.*

The same procedure was adopted by the Jews of Alexandria with regard to the Bible, and for similar reasons: they wanted to avoid the scandal that was caused in the cultivated Greek world if the old Bible stories were taken literally. The work of Philo was here of fundamental importance. In his *Quaestiones in Genesim,* for example, he provides in succession a psychological interpretation, a cosmological interpretation, and lastly a mystical interpretation (i.e. one concerning the intelligible world). Now, Philo had a considerable influence on the Fathers of the Church. We need go no further than those who, we can be sure, made direct use of his work. It is certain that Clement of Alexandria sometimes just transcribes what Philo had written, that Origen made considerable use of him, that Gregory of Nyssa derived from him his exegesis of man's creation, and that Ambrose follows him exactly in several treatises.

Parallel to the influence of Philo was that of the gnostics. While Marcion rejected allegorical interpretation, we know on the other hand that Valentinus and Basilides set much store by it. We possess Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora.* In particular, the gnostics developed the allegorical interpretation of the N.T., which for obvious reasons was foreign to Philo; we can get some idea of this from Heracleon's *Commentary on St John.* According to this gnostic exegesis, the persons and events of the O.T. or of the life of Jesus were reflections of the drama of the aeons of the pleroma. One can see that this kind of exegesis influenced Clement and Origen from the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* and from the *Commentary on St John.*

Thus the allegorical exegesis of the Fathers of the Church is closely connected with the religious atmosphere of the hellenistic world. It is also connected with the cultural atmosphere. There was a pronounced taste for symbolism in the literature of the Alexandrine age. Truth seemed more attractive, and less exposed to misunderstanding, if it was enveloped in mystery. "It is an advantage of myths", said the philosopher Sallustius, "that they provide us with matter for investigation, since they do not reduce our faculty for thinking to inactivity" (*The Gods and the World,* 3). Certain Fathers of the Church took the same view. Clement of Alexandria says that realities charm us the more when they are presented to us veiled; and Augustine, that there is more pleasure in contemplating the saints who come up from the baptismal font when this is ex-

pressed in the words of the Song of Songs: "Thy teeth are as a flock of sheep which go up from the washing."

But these kinds of allegory have nothing to do with typology, although in the Fathers the two are mixed up. Typology means not that there is a relation between things visible and invisible, but that there is a correspondence between historical realities at different stages in sacred history. There are three points to notice here. First, it is not a question of a hidden sense in the text of Scripture. Origen was mistaken in thinking that all the passages in the Bible had a hidden sense which only our ignorance prevents us from recognizing. It is the realities themselves that are types. It is the Flood that prefigured baptism and the Judgment, and Rahab the Gentiles who would be admitted into the New Israel.

Secondly, it is a question of a relation between realities both of which are historical, and not between historical realities and a timeless world. That is why nothing could be further from the truth than to reproach patristic exegesis with not taking history seriously. That is true of allegory but not of typology, of which the whole point is the correspondence between the two Testaments. No doubt what is earthly may be said to prefigure what is spiritual, but only in the biblical sense of the word, where "spiritual" designates the historical order that was inaugurated by the eschatological outpouring of the Holy Ghost. And finally the resemblance between the type and the anti-type, or between the figure and the reality, is contributed not by anything inherent in the persons or events in question, but by the fact that both form part of a single divine plan and both manifest the way the same God deals with his people. The typology is, as it were, his signature. Thus Isaac, spared and given back to his father, appears to us as a first adumbration of the risen Christ, returning to his Father's glory.

But, it will be asked, how are these authentic types to be recognized? It is not enough to have put allegory firmly on one side. It is also necessary in typology itself to distinguish what is valid from what is not. Every time water is mentioned, are we to see in it a figure of baptism? And is the fact that Rahab's thread was scarlet enough to make it a type of the Passion? Here again we are confronted by an infinite variety of possible interpretations, and it must be confessed that those proposed by the Fathers are of very unequal value. How are we to distinguish those that are worth retaining? Several criteria are to be taken into account.

First, there is tradition. When we can trace the history of a typological theme, which we meet in the Fathers, and discover it in the N.T., in Jewish literature, and in the O.T., there is an initial presumption that it is valid.

A second question to ask is whether the typology is based on the literal sense of the O.T. Here we are up against one of the real difficulties of patristic exegesis. Most of the Fathers were entirely ignorant of Hebrew. In fact none before St Jerome had more than a rudimentary knowledge of it. They approached the Bible through the LXX and with a Greek or Latin outlook. This explains why they often

followed false trails. In this respect our knowledge of semitic languages and oriental archaeology undoubtedly gives us an advantage over them. But on the other hand we must not forget that there was a greater continuity between their culture and that of the people of the Ancient East than there is in our case. Their habits of thought enabled them to sympathize more than we can with the authors whom they were studying. I will give only one example of this, the symbolism of numbers. It was common to the Semites and to the Greeks, even if they applied it differently. We can appreciate to-day that a Clement or an Origen was quite at home with some elements in Genesis or in St John's Gospel which our exegesis has for long misunderstood.

Another criterion is that the comparison ought not to depend on isolated words or images, but on what is really common to whole passages or incidents. Very often, in the N.T. itself, the comparison with the O.T. depends on an apparently insignificant detail. Thus St John compares Christ's limbs unfractured by the soldiers to the unbroken bones of the paschal lamb. To see no further than this detail would be unjust to St John. It is simply a signal that we ought to read again the whole story of the Exodus. Then we shall see that the Christ is the true paschal Lamb. Every time an isolated phrase like this is cited in the N.T., the whole episode in the O.T. should be read again. The word from the cross: *Eloï, Eloï, lama sabachtani?* should lead us to read again the whole of Psalm 22. The comparison is thus between whole passages or incidents. As A. G. Hebert has observed, we must not stop at "illustrative" analogies but get at the real correspondences.

When this work of distinguishing genuine typology from its distortions has been carried through, the fog of confusion which at first, as it were, hangs over the mass of the patristic commentaries begins to clear away and its main outline can be seen. Certain major themes stand out like summits. I have tried to disengage some of them in my book *Sacramentum futuri.* The first three chapters of Genesis, the stories of the Flood and of Isaac, the Exodus and the life of Moses, the stories of Joshua, David, and Elijah, are typologically in a class by themselves. They are to be found all over the place. They can be traced right into the heart of the O.T. They cannot fail to impress themselves on us. In fact, it is astonishing to see how great avenues take shape which lead us into the interior of what at first looked like an inextricable jungle.

II. But alongside this discrimination between what is valid and invalid, or between what is primary and secondary, a further task has to be undertaken if one is to find one's way through the mass of patristic exegesis. One must know the different forms which typology can take. Here, too often, attention has been confined to the usual classification of the Antiochene exegesis, which is more literal, and the Alexandrine, which is more symbolic. But, apart from the inexactness of this classification since Alexandria was more adept than Antioch in literal exegesis, it is very far from corresponding to the real complexity of the facts. We must come to the texts without

any preconceived framework into which we are going to press them, and see how they arrange themselves.

If what we are about to say is to be understood, it must be allowed that typology can have various aspects. The oldest typology and the foundation of all the others is eschatological typology. This is what the O.T. puts before us. The prophets declare to us that in the end of the times God will perform works analogous but superior to those which he has performed in the past. There will be a new Flood that will destroy the sinful world, as the one in the time of Noah did. And as in the time of the Exodus Yahweh had made "a way in the sea and a path in the mighty waters", so he "will do a new thing" with the result that "the former things" will no longer be remembered (Isa. 43. 16–20). All these themes are dominated by those of the second creation (which itself dominates Isaiah), of the new Paradise and of the eternal covenant.

The N.T. then did not have to invent typology. Its essential message is that the types are fulfilled in Jesus Christ. In him the sinful world is destroyed, the new creation is established, the new Israel is liberated, and the new covenant is constituted. It is important to notice that it is in so far as they are eschatological that the events of Christ's life are prefigured by the O.T. The various writings of the N.T. are more or less fond of different aspects of this typology. Christ is represented by Luke as a new Elijah, and by Matthew as a new Moses. The Fourth Gospel is dominated by the Exodus, the Epistle to the Romans by the theme of the New Adam. But they differ in other respects too. Matthew prefers to show the realization of the types in the biographical details of Christ's life. This continued to be a characteristic of Palestinian exegesis. On the other hand, John is more inclined to see fulfilments in the mysteries of the Incarnation. His analogies are more theological.

But the life of Christ does not exhaust the realities of the new covenant. It is continued in the Church, which is Christ's body, and in the members of the Church, who are the stones of the temple. Consequently, we have two new forms of typology. The first is churchly typology, of which the principal form is sacramental typology. This appears in St John and in the Pauline Epistles. For 1 Peter the Flood prefigures baptism. Then there is an individual typology according to which the inner life of the Christian was prefigured in the O.T. We strike it in St Paul when he speaks of "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth", or in the paschal catechesis with which 1 Peter opens. Thus it is possible to distinguish five principal forms of typology: matthaean, johannine, churchly, mystical, and eschatological.

These different forms are quite often intermingled by the Fathers. Origen combines several of them, and draws out of them a first sketch of a theory of spiritual senses. He distinguishes a literal sense, a moral sense, and an analogical sense. Sometimes he simply sets down several interpretations one after another. He sees the fall of Jericho successively as a type of the destruction of the power of Satan by Christ's resurrection, of the collapse of the world in the Chris-

tian's soul, and of the final destruction of the principalities and powers at the end of time (see *Sacramentum futuri*, pp. 249 ff.). Rahab is seen as a type of Mary Magdalene in the life of Christ, of the entry of the nations into the Church, and of the conversion of sinners.

Nevertheless, certain kinds of interpretation seem to be predominant in particular authors or groups of authors, and so a classification of exegetical schools is possible. For the most part this has yet to be done, but some main lines can already be indicated. Eschatological exegesis is particularly developed in the early Asiatic school: by Papias, Irenaeus, and later by Methodius of Olympus. It carries on the line of the Johannine Apocalypse. Moral exegesis was predominant at Alexandria. This is already clear in the case of Clement, where Philo's influence helped to accentuate it. In the case of Origen, without being exclusive, it is also predominant. In the West it appears in Ambrose, who carries on the Alexandrine tradition and breaks with the line that was followed by early Western exegesis.

The latter was characterized by the matthaean exegesis, i.e. by that which dwelt on analogies between the O.T. and the details of Christ's life. It comes out clearly in Hippolytus of Rome. It can be Further traced in the Sermons of Zeno of Verona or in the *Tractatus* of Gregory of Elvira. This type of exegesis, which may be connected with the realistic character of the Latin mind, had another focal centre, namely Jerusalem. It is characteristic of the Catecheses of St Cyril. This can be accounted for by the importance which the memories of Christ's earthly life naturally had in Palestine. Similarly, in the liturgical field, Baumstark has observed that it was at Jerusalem that the liturgical festivals ceased to be "fêtes d'idée" and became historical commemorations. This is the kind of exegesis which Origen formally repudiated as too materialistic. As for sacramental exegesis, which is the most traditional of all, it is most frequently to be found in the mystical catecheses.

Special mention must be made of what is called the school of Antioch. It is marked not by any particular form of typological exegesis, but by its tendency altogether to restrict this kind of exegesis so far as possible, i.e. by retaining it only in those cases where tradition made it practically obligatory. This is especially obvious in the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia. But it had a curious consequence. Since they refused to relate the sacraments to the historical realities of the Old Testament and of eschatology, the Antiochenes came to interpret their symbolism as expressing a relation between visible and invisible realities. And so, through their refusal to accept historical typology, they ended up in a platonic kind of allegorization which was entirely foreign to genuine tradition. This is already apparent in Theodore, and it becomes glaring in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius.

In conclusion, I would call attention to one of the advantages of these studies in patristic typology. They re-establish a continuity between biblical and patristic theology. In fact we have here a funda-

mental idea which is common to them both. More especially, it seems that typology may help us to a recovery of the Kerygma of primitive Christianity. This seems partly to have consisted in showing that the O.T. types were realized in the Christ. Perhaps it was for this reason that collections of *Testimonia* came into existence. We can recover part of the contents of these *Testimonia* by a study of the N.T., but undoubtedly we have other elements in them transmitted by the Fathers. If St John enables us to see that the brazen serpent belonged to these testimonies, it is very likely that the prayer of Moses with his arms outstretched, which is associated with it both by the Rabbis and by the Fathers, also belonged to them, as T. W. Manson has shown.[1] Thus typology is found to be at the point where N.T. exegesis and patristics meet in the life of the ancient Christian community.

JEAN DANIÉLOU, S.J.

Mariology and the Bible

FOR the average Anglican the Protevangelium is not a controversial matter, as it was on the Continent in the days after the Reformation. He may feel that it is better to discuss the place of the Blessed Virgin in the plan of salvation in connexion with some New Testament passage like Luke 1. 26–56. (However, Dodd and other recent theologians are accustoming us more now to think of the Gospel in terms of fulfilled prophecy.[1])

It may even be desirable to remind our average Anglican of what the Protevangelium is. It is the word spoken by the Lord God to the serpent in Gen. 3. 15. "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." In the Vulgate this reads: "Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem et semen tuum et semen illius; *ipsa* conteret caput tuum et tu *insidiaberis* calcaneo eius." "Insidiaberis", "thou shalt lay wait", comes from the Greek Septuagint. But "ipsa", "she", instead of "ipsum" or "ipse", is peculiar to the Vulgate. We are sometimes told that it was introduced into the Vulgate text in order to forward mariolatry, but, as we shall see, this statement cannot be substantiated.

Recently the editor, of his bounty, sent me a book on the Protevangelium to review. It was by "Tibertius Gallus, S.J." It was in Latin, with all the proper imprimaturs, published at Rome ("Apud Edizioni de Storia e Litteratura") and dedicated "Piissimae et potentissimae Matri divinae Amoris". Its title read "INTERPRETATIO MARIOLOGICA PROTOEVANGELII POSTTRIDENTINA usque ad definitionem dogmaticam Immaculatae Conceptionis. Pars Prior, Aetas aurea exegesis Catholicae a Concilio Tridentino (1545) usque ad annum 1660". In fact it sounded at once dull and exaggerated, the sort of book sent off by a cruel editor with a malicious grin, and received by a much-enduring reviewer with a sigh and a groan, to be dismissed with as few words as possible in the shortest of the shorter notices.

[1] "The Argument from Prophecy" in *J.T.S.*, July–October 1945, p. 132.

But the book was not dull. It was full of shocks, surprises, illuminations, and delights!

The first thing we notice is that, out of the 184 commentators quoted, 32 are Continental Protestants! Among them are Calvin, Melanchthon, Beza, Osiander, and Gerhard the hymn-writer. Sixteen pages, the largest share of space given to any single commentator, are awarded to the Protestant Glassius (Salomon Glass). Not only their arguments but their exceedingly vigorous invective is reproduced in full! If we expected a packed jury or suborned witnesses, we were very much mistaken. The editor, Father Gallus, seems very fair in his judicial summaries of the evidence presented and the opinions expressed.

In the period 1545–1592 we get 10 Protestants and 38 Roman Catholics. Of the latter only 21 attempt a mariological interpretation. The remarkable fact is that they base it on "inimicitias ponam", and not on the notorious "ipsa conteret". At that time there was as yet no definitive edition of the Vulgate, and "Ipse" or "ipsum" figured in the margin. The editor proves that (1) "Ipsa conteret" was adopted "through an exaggerated respect for the consent of the Fathers", and (2) that, whatever may be said of earlier days, during this period it was not associated with mariology or mariolatry. So, having shown the Protestant vituperation to be undeserved, he does not mind giving it plenty of space, apart from other worthier motives.

In the next period, 1592–1660, there are 22 Protestants to 38 Romanists. Of the latter 80 per cent. instead of a mere 55 per cent. interpret the text mariologically. But they still stick to "inimicitias ponam". The Calvinists explain the "seed of the woman" as referring to the whole human race, but the Lutherans and most of the Romans interpret it of Christ alone. The editor pronounces that the Protestants are right about the text, in rejecting the reading "ipsa", but that they are wrong in their exposition, in which they exclude the Blessed Virgin from consideration. (Anglican expositors should please him.)

Father Gallus gives us a surprisingly just account of the Sextine and Clementine editions of the Vulgate. A papal commission had settled on what was obviously the best text. But Pope Sixtus rejected most of their emendations, and insisted on doing the work himself. He composed a Bull and a Constitution asserting the utter authenticity and forbidding all future changes of the text, but, as the editor does not fail to hint, he would have been better occupied in making sure of the text than in polishing and repolishing his pronouncements about it. Yet even when the text was printed parts of it were corrected by pen and ink, by erasure, and by pieces pasted over. After which Sixtus died. The papal commission wanted to have it totally prohibited, but Bellarmine persuaded them to gentler courses. The sale of Sixtus' edition, published in May 1590, was stopped. Under Clement VIII a new amended edition was published in its place, with a preface put together from Sixtus' Bull.

Salmon in his *Infallibility* tells us that the edition of Clement differed from that of Sixtus in more than 2,000 places, and tells us

a number of other things which no one in his senses would expect the editor to proclaim upon the housetops.

Father Gallus, however, favours us with some remarks on the authority of the Vulgate, quoting and elucidating statements by Alberto Vaccari. These are of considerable interest and importance. We are told that the Tridentine decree should be interpreted as saying that the Vulgate conforms with the original Hebrew only in its general substance, not in detail. It is only in matters of dogma, of faith and morals, that its immunity from error is asserted. So the Massoretic Hebrew is the supreme authority for the Old Testament. In accordance with this principle, the Protevangelium (Gen. 3. 15) is set out at the beginning of the book in Hebrew and Greek, with the Vulgate Latin in the third place. Father Gallus does not fail to quote Jerome's "melius habetur in hebraeo: 'ipse conteret caput tuum et tu conteres eius calcaneum". (For the second *conteres*, the Vulgate has *insidiaberis*, following the Septuagint.) It will be remembered how in 1945 the Pontifical Biblical Institute published a new Latin version of the Psalter, translated from a revised and emended Hebrew text, of which Mgr R. A. Knox published an English version in 1947. All this indicates a new policy on the part of the Roman authorities which (however obvious and overdue we may think it) we ought to receive with rejoicing.

Father Gallus makes some acute observations in the following passage which seems to us worth translating:

> "Would that the Post-Tridentine interpreters of the authenticity of the Vulgate (as a translation) and of the authority of the Fathers who read 'ipsa conteret' had been as sober in their estimate (as Vaccari). If for example, 'ipse' or 'Ipsum conteret' had been added to the 'readings to be deliberately changed' (Preface of Clementine Edition), then the Antimarian attitude of the Reformers and their attack on the reading 'ipsa' would have been deprived of any foundation. It is through an exaggerated respect for the consent of the Fathers who read 'ipsa conteret' that the Clementine retains the feminine pronoun. The innovators, however, think that the Church retained the reading 'ipsa' in order to give support to the cult of the Blessed Virgin, though, as we have just seen, they were entirely mistaken in such a supposition. So, through a false supposition on the part of the innovators, the reading 'ipsa' of the Clementine edition became a stumbling-block to them, by which they always suffered a violent divagation into an Antimarian attitude. Catholic interpreters, on the other hand, in spite of regarding 'ipsa conteret' as an authentic reading, never understood it of the Blessed Virgin in an absolute or primary sense, but always in a relative and consequential sense; 'She shall bruise thy head' by the mediation of her Son whom she bore."

In the fourth century in Arabia, a sect of heretics arose who offered divine honours and little cakes to the Blessed Virgin. They were called "Collyridians" after the word for the cakes. As was to be expected, an opposite sect arose, who made it a principle to speak irreverently of her, and were termed "Antidicomarians". We cannot take part with either heresy, so as to adore or abominate the Blessed Virgin as an independent individual. It depends on our answer to the question "What think ye of Christ, whose Son is he?" It depends on our understanding of how he is the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, yet also the Son of Mary, made very man of

the substance of the Virgin Mary his mother, by the operation of the Holy Ghost. It depends also upon our interpretation of the words "I have said ye are gods, and ye are all the children of the most high", or, in short, on our doctrine of grace.

Karl Barth in *The Church and the Churches* suggests that the way to truth and unity is for each Church and school of thought to be loyal to God and truth through its own principles. "Let the Roman Church work out its doctrine of nature and grace, with the Tridentine teaching on justification to their logical conclusions; let the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies do the same with their specific eucharistic doctrine, and neo-Protestantism with its doctrine of man's natural goodness; but let them do this not merely in a syllogistic spirit, nor as working with logical fervour on the basis of presuppositions which stop short of being ultimate, but as listening to the Christ, to Christ of the Scriptures." Father Gallus' book is something of an approach to meeting this invitation. It even goes a step further, since it gives a number of long departed Protestant scholars a part in the discussion. Let us now hear what Barth (in his *Dogmatik*, 1/2) has to contribute to the discussion. He regards Roman mariolatry as the logical consequence of the Roman doctrine of grace and merit. "The Church in which Mary is revered must be understood as it understood itself at the Vatican Council, for what such a Church must necessarily be: the Church of a humanity which co-operates in grace on the basis of grace."

For the Evangelical or Protestant, says Barth, "Grace is the direct opposite to reciprocity. It is the act by which all reciprocity is repudiated, the act of recognizing the One Mediator, besides whom there is no other. Revelation and Reconciliation are one-sided, unshared in, exclusively the work of God. So the question, which the Roman Catholic doctrine of grace and the Church as exemplified in mariology aspires to answer, is an improper question, the attempt to answer which must perforce lead to erroneous doctrine. . . ." "It is, however, but just to say that the resistance of Protestantism to mariology and mariolatry will for its part be improper so long as that same Protestantism continues to be occupied or reoccupies itself with improper questions, and to stand for the corresponding erroneous doctrines of a half-grace and the leadership-principle in the Church. It is in fact only the fundamentally unclassical character of this Protestantism, which has hitherto prevented it from forming something like a mariology of its own."

Hans Asmussen, the Lutheran scholar, approaches the subject along this very route, which Barth has tried to close. He regards Mary as "the connecting-link, which attaches the Lord Christ to humanity", and "the sign set up in human history to tell us that grace alone operates, but that it operates in such human beings as co-operate with it." Asmussen has attempted a Lutheran mariology in his delightful little book, *Maria, die Mutter Gottes.*

Barth is notorious for his doctrinaire repudiation of anything in the nature of mysticism, synergism, and of any natural theology or connecting-link which suggests that man can co-operate with God's

grace. Only too many of us are inclined to resist him from wrong motives and reasons. Let us remember that our resistance should not be liberal or Pelagian, but Scriptural, Pauline (fellow-workers with God), and Petrine (partakers of the divine nature), not to say Christian (if he called them gods to whom the Spirit of the Lord came).

This, however, only serves to give additional force to the following statement of Barth's (in translating the complicated German period, we had better break it up for the benefit of the reader): "What if a man, even as an Evangelical Christian and theologian, does not in any way reject the description of Mary as 'Mother of God'? What if, in spite of its undesirable associations, due to the so-called mariology of the Roman Church, he gives his assent and approval to the term, and regards it as a legitimate expression of Christian truth? His doing so amounts to something like a proof that he has a right understanding of the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Word."

In this connexion, Barth observes on how Luther frequently employed the term "Mother of God" of Mary. Zwingli (*Expos. Christ. Fid.* 1536) says "Virginem deiparam Theotokon appellari iusto vocabulo et iudicamus et probemus." Calvin alone avoids using the term, though he does not oppose or deny it.

The greatest of our divines, such at least as Hooker, Andrewes, Taylor, and Pearson, regarded the Blessed Virgin not only as Theotokos, Deipara, Mother of God, but also as Aeiparthenos, semper virgo, ever virgin. "We cannot", says Pearson, "bear too reverend a regard unto the mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive church; 'Let her be honoured and esteemed, let him be worshipped and adored'." We can sympathize with the principle stated by the Eastern monk who was the author of *Orthodox Spirituality* in the words "The most Orthodox form of piety towards the mother of the Saviour is undoubtedly the evangelical one, i.e. piety towards Mary as it flows from the sacred texts themselves."

The best barrier against a Collyridian mariolatry is a Scriptural mariology—though it might be better not to isolate Mary so far as to speak of mariology, since it is a part of Christology. We notice that Christ was born of Mary, but that he is not recorded as having made any Resurrection appearance to her. We cannot ignore the Blessed Virgin. We have the Festivals of the Annunciation and Purification, we have the Creed and the Magnificat, at Christmas too she plays her part and is referred to in the proper preface. She does not appear by herself, but in association with her Son. Only when she is separated from him and from his Word are men led to Assumptions and Conceptions not mentioned in, nor agreeable to, Scripture.

We may be permitted to conclude with three expositions of Gen. 3, 15 which are representative of this point of view, and which we believe Father Gallus would acknowledge to be neither "antimarian" nor uncatholic.

Pearson has a brief reference in his *Creed*. Christ, he says, was

"promised first to Eve as her seed and consequently as her Son. . . . The name of seed is not generally and collectively to be taken for the generality of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed which is Christ; so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come."

Bishop Bull speaks more fully and clearly:

"The Blessed Virgin Mary was the only woman that took off the stain and dishonour of her sex, by being the instrument of bringing that into the world, which should repair and make amends for the loss and damage brought to mankind by the transgression of the first woman, Eve. By a woman, as the principal cause, we were first undone; and by a woman, as an instrument under God, a Saviour and Redeemer is born to us. . . . But, you will say, how did Eve receive comfort from the Blessed Virgin Mary? I answer, in that gracious promise delivered by God himself in the sentence passed on the serpent, after Eve's seduction by him, where it was said 'that the seed of the woman should break the serpent's head'. Every man now knows that the seed there spoken of is Christ; and consequently that the individual woman, whose immediate seed he was to be, is the Blessed Virgin Mary. The holy Virgin was the happy instrument of the saving Incarnation of the Son of God, who hath effectually crushed the old serpent, the devil, and destroyed his power over all those who believe on himself, and thereby she became the instrument of comfort to Eve and all other sinners. . . . He that was born of her, at the very time that he was born of her, was Theanthropos, God and Man. O astonishing condescension of the Son of God! O wonderful advancement of the Blessed Virgin. . . . We will not give her lavish and excessive attributes, beyond what the Holy Scriptures allow her, and the holy men of the primitive Church afforded her. . . ."

Let us also give some parts of an average statement of a later period (H. E. Ryle, Bishop of Winchester, in his *Early Narratives of Genesis*, 1890–1):

"The merely literal explanation of the verse does not exhaust its meaning . . . the underlying thought is that of a spiritual conflict . . . a two-fold encouragement is given to nerve man for the fray. He is endowed with capacities enabling him, if he will use them, to inflict a deadly blow upon the adversary. He stands erect, he is made in the image of God. Furthermore, the promise of ultimate victory is assured to him . . . and yet, quite general as the words seem to be in their application to those who shall be descended from the woman, we cannot fail to see, in the light of the New Testament, the appropriateness of the language used to its Messianic verification. 'The seed of the woman' has triumphed through him who is the representative of all mankind (cf. Rom. 5. 12–21), through him who, being born of a pure Virgin, was in a special sense 'the seed of the woman'. That victory was potential for the whole race. Its full consummation shall be hereafter. 'And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.' (Rom. 16. 20)."

Cosslett Quin.

Science, Sin and Sacrament

Whatever history may make of Bishop Barnes, now he belongs to it; and it is for us, after this interval for due tributes, to begin the inquiry why he, a man gentle, honest and good, academically once of extreme promise, aroused in the Church distress, anger, and even contempt. It seems unlikely that the ultimate historian of the spirituality of our age will accept the view, to which the obituaries almost uniformly adhered, that the hard feelings were due chiefly to

our intellectual conservatism. Although *The Rise of Christianity* was widely counted a disgrace both to scholarship and to episcopacy, good books by old bishops are not many. Few responsible critics would regret that Barnes ever entered controversy: most would hold that the battle of faith is decided, not on the mathematical Himalayas, but in the cities of what is, intellectually, the plain. And the substitution of knowledge and experience for biblical and ecclesiastical infallibility, which Barnes so publicly propagated, is axiomatic save on the fringes of the Church of England.

The question comes to this: why was the honour withheld from Barnes accorded in the end to an even more frequently controversial ecclesiastic, Henson? And the right answer to this question is not the one recently written into Dr Moorman's *History of the Church in England*, that Henson yielded to orthodoxy. Henson never made *de fide* belief in the Virgin Birth or Physical Resurrection. He went all the way with the 1938 Commissioners, and a good deal further. His *Retrospect* shows that. So the question narrows. Was Henson's zeal for liturgical discipline (which he rated yet higher than Establishment) merely a compensation for credal disquiet? Or did it also indicate Henson's fundamental difference from Barnes, his attitude to the sacramental order? The impression left on the public by Barnes was that he dismissed sacraments as "magic". *Should Such a Faith Offend?* shows that he did not. But neither did he hold that our Lord instituted the Eucharist. The Church did that, adding to magic—which should now be dropped—the ethical truth: "All the associations of the service bring the Lord's sacrifice to our minds." True religion for Barnes was right conduct based upon a right understanding of the universe. The mind of man was free and hopeful in an evolutionary process distinct from mind. Barnes, in short, addressed Enlightenment, while year by year the fears that science could not tame the wickedness of the heart, that men were abusing and destroying the beneficence of nature, that mere acts of will could not secure a "natural" life—the atrophy of the liberal imagination and the general failure of mind—all these increased in the Church a sacramentalist tendency already continuous since the childhood of the Tractarians. Men were now seen as the rebels in the cosmic story. Deliverance was now sought in that ultimately difficult attitude at which Carlyle blustered, the acceptance of the universe. For the few, acceptance might be made through the artist's symbols; for the millions, the media were water and food. For Barnes, it was idolatry to suppose that water and food in the Christian community changed the worshippers, incorporating them into Christ who sums up all things. Rather, God's love was conveyed by people who understood and obeyed his purpose: water and food were symbols chosen by those people to express their faith. Henson, being an historian and a pastor, saw that to which the scientific and theoretical Barnes was blind: the foundation of Catholicism in sin and sacrament.

A necessary supplement to his *Retrospect*, itself so largely consumed by controversies in most of which he constituted himself the opposition, and in many of which he now looks foolish, is a little-

known letter which Henson addressed to C. A. Alington on the eve of the latter's ordination at Cuddesdon in 1899. "There is suffering quite unique in nature and intensity wrapped up in this self-surrender to the Service of Souls", Henson wrote.[1] "One's own faults come home to one with such cruel insistence, and, as the years pass, failures add their dead weight to the heart. One has dark hours, God knows, when the worth of the Ministry, the very genuineness of that vast system of Religion, which the Ministry symbolizes and interprets, are wrapped in doubt. . . . Still, after twelve years of fault and failure and sorrow, I think of Ordination as having *essentially* little to do with subscriptions and formulae—being in reality the answer to Christ's personal vocation, an answer which one must make. . . . Everything else fails us: he alone remains. One is untrue to oneself: he is true to us always." No one theory about the sacraments may be derived from such an expression of the need of a saviour, but that letter does illuminate the psychologically dark years of Henson's obscurity. It does enable us to answer the preliminary question, which is what these two bishops were after. Without knowledge of his early dependence on the presence of Christ among Christians who are not fully faithful and who do not clearly understand, and of his early and (despite a natural arrogance) always fundamental rejection of self-confidence, we might judge the pastoral inclusiveness and pragmatic traditionalism of Henson's episcopate to have been based solely on expediency, and might think unduly severe the criticism of the religious attitude of Barnes, which he dictated from his deathbed.[2]

It was, in fact, Henson who was the truer modernist, and who, although not (what he called Gore) "utterly a Catholick", saw that it is not enough for our pastors to tell us that we have the mind of Christ. Increasingly we understand both the union between the mental and the physical in the individual, and the connexion of the individual's character with the social complex around. If we are not to be moulded by an atheist society, we need the presence of God in the character-forming depths of personality which feed the discursive reason: and we need a community already formed by God. We cry for Christ's body, in both its meanings; and on the intellectualism and the individualism assumed by Barnes, Henson's is the epitaph: "Everything else fails us." An account of the Christian religion in this century must reckon this experience of Christ by doubting and disloyal Christians among the chief of its data.

For an understanding of the experience, we must go to those who have entered into it most deeply by participation in worship. The recent collection of nine essays by Dr E. L. Mascall on the Church and the Eucharist, entitled *Corpus Christi*, has therefore a special significance.[3] "There is a sense in which Christ's redemptive work

[1] Quoted by permission from C. A. Alington, *A Dean's Apology* (Faber, 1952), p. 46.
[2] *Letters of H. H. Henson* (ed. E. F. Braley, S.P.C.K., 1950), p. 218.
[3] Longmans, 15s. Six of the essays have appeared in journals.

has communicated the divine life to all mankind," Dr Mascall writes (p. 12). "There is even a sense in which the act of creation itself has communicated the divine life to the whole created order. . . . But, as a fully operative reality in the historical order, it is the Catholic Church that is the supernatural organism in which men, by sacramental incorporation into Christ, are elevated into the life of the Holy Trinity and, by the Sacrament of the Eucharist, are maintained therein." The Sacrament is here seen from the Church's experience: "It is the whole Christ, in his ascended glory, who is present in the Eucharist, and he is present as the food of the whole man" (p. 122).

The heart of the book is in two long essays on the Eucharistic Canon and Sacrifice. Here Dr Mascall develops the themes of Dix and of the French Catholic theologians, de la Taille, Vonier, and Masure. He stresses that the words of Institution were at the Last Supper a formula not of consecration but of distribution after the blessing, which for Jews as for early Christians lay in the Eucharist, in the acceptance of the elements from God. The command to "do this" is thus not to be taken as a command to repeat an incantation. The acceptable thanksgiving of the Church, Dr Mascall further argues (and here he criticizes teaching associated with the Parish Communion), is neither its offertory nor any other part of its rite, but its share in the completed sacrifice of Christ. "The sacrifice of the Mass does not consist in its being an event which happens to Christ after his Ascension and which in some way repeats or imitates his death, but in its being the means by which the whole sacrificial action of Christ, centred in the Cross and culminating in the Ascension, is made sacramentally present in the Church" (p. 96). Other essays discuss the theories of the Eucharistic Presence advanced by Aquinas and Gore. Dr Mascall criticizes the idealist philosophy of Gore, but also denies that, when the bread and wine "cease to have the status of substance", anything is taken from them. All this takes us far beyond the "superstition" which Barnes attacked.

Gratitude for such teaching makes criticism hard, but in a book so respectful of Christian history and of the intelligible use of language, it is odd to see produced as a theory "quite central to the question of the Church's unity" the speculation that "a man enters the Episcopate by consecration, but does not leave it by death" (p. 21). Essays on "Adoration", "Benediction", and "Private Masses" make a sketchy appeal to ancient precedents in arguing that such practices are included within the command to "do this": the very old and wide doctrine that the Eucharistic Presence is promised only to those who eat the food is brushed aside as "impossibly sophisticated" (p. 171), while the primitive principle that each order should perform its own *leitourgia* is held to justify "Private Masses" for priests (p. 161), whereas in history the principle justified only concelebration. In general, it must be said that a more documented Ecclesiology will be needed in the Eucharistic treatise at which these essays hint. Dr Mascall's use of "Catholic" does not make up for the absence of a definition of authority. But already we have a lucid

exposition of a central theme, the discussion of which—so urgent is the practical consequence—might unite the Catholics and Protestants, theologians and scientists, now separated by the sacrament of unity.

The Eucharist is set in, and represents, a world which is somehow to be accepted as sacramental also. I place beside Dr Mascall's essays the second series of Gifford Lectures delivered by Dr C. E. Raven at Edinburgh in 1951–52, and now printed under the title *Experience and interpretation.*[1] Dr Raven does not show inward understanding of Catholicism, although his thought may be linked with (e.g.) Dr Thornton's: his references to Dr Barth are unworthy of a theologian himself also so very widely honoured: and in the book as a whole, readers may find more denunciation than discernment of contemporary theology. But to the Church as it is, post-Barnes, Dr Raven's argument should prove richly suggestive. His "liberalism" is subtle: he reaffirms the sacramentalist insistence on a unitary experience of the universe, while repudiating the false antitheses, basic to many misunderstandings, between mind and body, order and miracle, fact and mystery, modernity and the Fall. He sees the Christian religion as response to a universe "in Christ".

"That man in attaining his self-consciousness encounters the universe and recognizes it as other and alien", he writes (p. 24), "and that his awareness of the mystery and the wonder and the fear associated with it disclose to him his individuality, these are alternative methods of stating the characteristic experience which constitutes his human status." Such experience of the Fall is the basis of all religion, but it is embodied in largely dissimilar interpretations. It becomes necessary to choose between the theologies. What, then, are the criteria? Dr Raven quotes John Oman (p. 33 n.): "If reconciliation to the evanescent is revelation of the eternal, and revelation of the eternal a higher reconciliation to the evanescent, that is only as we know all environment, which is by living in accord with it." Those who accept the universe accept its prize of love: and love demands community. Community demands also self-sacrifice, but in self-sacrifice is revealed the true character of nature, man and God. Three sentences are signposts to this argument. "We shall be thinking in terms of a single but pluralistic universe in which psycho-physical organisms at different levels of development constitute a community held together by their relationship to a single integrative reality, fulfilling in spite of, or rather by reason of, their individual activities a common intention, and when conditions are appropriate to it giving occasion for the appearance of the novel and the unprecedented" (p. 144). "As the several members find each his proper function in the economy of the whole, their fellowship develops a spontaneous co-operation in obedience to the creative guidance of the indwelling Spirit" (p. 176). "The universe itself co-operates for good to those that love God" (p. 203).

His treatment of religious experience may already have given

[1] Cambridge University Press, 21s.

readers a sense of the candour and vital orthodoxy of Dr Raven's work in its bulk. *Experience and Interpretation* owes much of its force to the eloquence of the pulpit, but this eloquence is controlled by glad acknowledgement of the new developments in philosophy and the biological sciences. An "holistic" approach finds in Christ the key to the universe. Since "it is Christ's unique illumination of our darkness, his power to waken and quicken our sensitiveness, the wonder and wisdom of his love, that proclaim him to be 'the image of the invisible' " (p. 80), God is described in terms of light and life and love, Christ in terms of personality not metaphysics, and nature in terms of organism not mechanism, growth not struggle. Romans 8 is taken as the foundation of a whole cosmology. At the point which Dr Mascall (with SS. Paul and John) would regard as crucial, the revelation and communication of the love emergent in the universe in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, sacramentally conveyed to penitents, Dr Raven falls silent. He lectured on a foundation which excludes revealed religion, and, writing for a public wider and more sceptical than Dr Mascall's, he may well have felt it right to adhere to the tradition of reserve concerning the sacraments in apologetics. But his point is that the whole of the universe is a sign of love, and this point he has made magnificently. In the development of the sacramentalism we need, *Experience and Interpretation* will stand both as a directive sign and as its author's best monument.

D. L. Edwards.

The Two Milking Stools

Anyone who preaches must, from time to time, wonder exactly what results his efforts for the Kingdom have. Do his words help or hinder the Word of God? This is a simple question to ask, but the answer is, sometimes, discovered in the oddest ways and places.

As both a rustic and a reader I am called on at times to preach at very short notice in small, geographically remote churches. I have a few stock sermons, themes upon which it is not difficult to play a number of variations. For my own use (and incidentally sometimes for the information of my wife) these have names, Jairus's Daughter, A Saving Health, etc. One is The Milking Stool.

The brief outline of this last is as follows: A real and firm faith in Christ is like the top of a three-legged stool; supported by the three legs (*a*) the Scriptures, (*b*) the authority of the Church, and (*c*) Personal conviction or the inner light of the soul. A great many Christians tend to put too much weight on one or two legs. Now a one-, two-, or even four-legged stool is never as firm as a three-legged one; yet a one-legged—a shooting-stick—faith, wobbly as it is, is what many attempt to sit on before the Lord. Whole sections of the Church, as Rome, Geneva, or the Quakers, give undue stress to one leg and forget the others. Not so with true Anglicanism which sees, or should see, each leg as both dependent on and independent of the other two. Look for a moment at such a stool; at first sight it is simple. But look again, there is a subtlety in it, not to mention a

series of complex angles. Each leg is only strong and useful as it upholds and works *with* the others. It is, in effect, a perfect example of a triple alliance. Separate as the legs may seem, in fact their strength and purpose are only fulfilled as they exist with and against the other two. The weakness of each is in itself, the strength of each lies in the others. So it is with the Anglican's authority for faith in the Scriptures, the Church, and the Inner Light, for which there is no order of precedence, each being both before and after the others.

Besides being a rustic and a reader, I am a very third-rate amateur carpenter. Into my workshop one day recently a farmer friend came; could I make him a new milking stool? X and Y (naming local professionals) made very poor ones. I explained that of all the work a carpenter may be called on to do a three-legged stool is perhaps one of the most difficult if it is to be both strong and light, which are essentials of a practical stool. I mentioned then my sermon, in which he took but polite interest; he wanted a stool. My sermon, I explained, had been inspired by my failure rather than success at my previous attempt to make one. He appeared to believe that I could make a serviceable stool. Thus I agreed to attempt to do so, but made no rash promise of delivery. It is part of my sermon that such a stool, as a firm and lasting faith, is not a simple thing to make. Now I was faced with demonstrating this to myself. I do not know which—my sermon or the stool—was the type and which the antitype, but as I began on the milking stool my task and my sermon became mutually illuminating. My workshop and my study came together; ideas had to be made incarnate in wood, else my reputation as a carpenter and as a preacher (if I have any at all) would disappear together.

It was as a bodger,[1] rather than as a carpenter, I produced a stool. It looked like the real thing and appeared firm when I sat on it myself to the degree that I could, conditionally, deliver it according to contract. The condition being that payment should be made only if the stool was standing up to the rigours of cowshed life twice daily after three months; by which time it will surely have been tested by both man and beast.

The effect of my labours was to make me think theologically. First about my sermon—my original analogy still seemed good, perhaps better than ever. Each leg by itself was simple enough to produce, but to fit them together so that each assisted the others in supporting the seat was as intricate as the interplay of the Bible, the Church, and our personal inner light in true Anglicanism. Was this what the "judicious" Hooker was trying to affirm in all his writings? But it was to Latimer rather than Hooker that my thoughts turned. He would have wholly appreciated my thoughts; he would have taken the bare bones of my outline and made a sermon as famous and as helpful to the Word of God as his on the plough. Latimer uses the plough as an analogy, yet behind it all is the real understanding of a farmer's son, of one brought to proclaim the gospel through the

[1] One who bodges, i.e. puts together clumsily, makes in a clumsy fashion (*N.E.D.*).

realization that husbandry is divinely ordained. Latimer seems to see not an analogy or even a correspondence, but a lively connexion between the life of the land and the life in the gospel. His great attack on popery is that it is content with the imperfections of analogy. Popery of his day, as much theology of to-day, as good as said that though heaven and earth were both divine, heaven was more divine than earth. This is what, as a rustic, I question. If we are right about the facts of the incarnation, we must not interpret them so that the divine is better than the human. To do so is to misunderstand rather than understand the kenotic theory.

I also saw a connexion between my stool and sermon and the growing interest in symbolism and analogy in biblical studies. L. S. Thornton and Austin Farrer would perhaps treat the legs of a stool and the interconnexion of the Church, the Bible, and the inner light in a way quite different from mine. They would stress the difference, rather than emphasize the likeness of the symbolism. To them, if I understand their reasoning aright, the "higher" must always take precedence over the "lower".[1] The good analogy (and the only claim I make for mine is that it is not wholly bad) ought, surely, to lead away from symbolism towards sacramentalism; that is towards a *living* connexion. I do not claim that my stool was sacramental. In this case the sacramental element comes in the divine judgment of myself.

If I may assume for a moment that God is more merciful towards some sins and shortcomings than others, then he judges my sermon and my stool. To my sermon, perhaps, he is more merciful than I realize, but my stool? The Son of the carpenter stands near the bench. He will not take the wood and fashion it, but if I had taken more time, more care, or had measured this or that angle with greater diligence . . . True his mercy is as much as, if not greater than, that over my sermon, but only because his judgment is greater. Perhaps few would agree that I come under judgment more for my milking stool than my sermon. But that is the curious result of my sermon, which, to be frank, I cannot explain because I do not understand.

W. S. Boycott.

An Unpublished Letter from John Keble

Hursley Vicarage,
March 26, 1861.

My Dear Miss X.,

I am very much concerned that I should at all have added to your distress through my negligence. I confess that altho' I was far from forgetting you (for I believe I have thought of you every morning since you were here) I had quite forgotten promising to send you a Service. I now forward what has occurred to me: which may at any rate give you some hints towards contriving one for yourself. May I caution you against an error, incidental to persons in distress of mind, of allowing themselves to behave outwardly or inwardly as if

[1] Cp. Thornton, *Revelation and the Modern World*, pp. 308 f.

God had cast them off; taking a sort of delight in strong expressions or ideal pictures of their own misery: and so, it may be, instinctively tempting themselves to take some step for relief, to which at the bottom of their hearts they are inclined, and yet have conscientious misgivings. I have known cases where the distress has been as it were in a childish way aggravated and then pleaded to overbear the misgivings. Such a thing is at least possible, both in temporal and in spiritual anxieties: and I am sure you will excuse my mentioning it to you, after the confidence you have placed in me. Would I could be indeed of use and comfort to you: but you are in the hands of One who will be more than all, if you will be patient and persevering. To His blessing I commit you: being always, my dear young Lady, in Him your faithful servant,

J. Keble.

Lord, have mercy upon us
Christ
Lord

Our Father

V. My Lovers and Friends hast thou put away from me
R. And hid mine acquaintance out of my sight.

Ps. 143. My lovers

Let us pray

Mindful, etc. (*Paradise of the Xn Soul*, p. 23)

Or (after the Lord's Prayer)

V. My soul melteth away for very heaviness
R. Comfort thou me according to thy Word.

Ps. 25. My soul

Let us pray

Most merciful God, whose infinite truth is the sole foundation of my faith, whose power and mercy are the sole resource of my hope, and whose infinite goodness and perfection are the sole objects of my love; preserve me by thy divine grace from all error, infidelity, obstinacy, and blindness of heart; from the dangerous rocks of presumption and despair; from all inordinate attachments to this world; from every evil disposition of mind towards my neighbour: that believing in thee, hoping in thee, and loving thee above all things in this life, I may enjoy thee eternally in the next; thro' the infinite merits of Jesus Xt. Amen.

Text. Lamentations 3. 26.
Blessing. Numbers 6. 24–26.

The following Collect may be used instead of, or in addition to, either of the above:
O God, the Restorer and Lover of Innocency, guide towards Thyself, we beseech Thee, the hearts of Thy servants; that being touched with the warmth of Thy Spirit, they may prove both steadfast in Faith, and in Obedience true and patient: Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

This service may be used in the night, if there is any special time when a person is apt to be awake: or at such time in the day as is apt to bring on sad thoughts or whenever it may be found most convenient.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Père Jean Daniélou, S.J., is Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Institut Catholique in Paris.

The Rev. Cosslett Quin is Rector of Narraghmore, co. Kildare, Ireland.

Mr Edwards is a Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.

Mr Boycott is a farmer and a Lay Reader.

CORRESPONDENCE

HOW CHRISTIAN WAS SHAKESPEARE?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It was not my intention to question the "sincerity" of teachers or to urge that they should find an "exposition" of the Christian faith in Shakespeare: Dr Byles should reconsider the title of my small essay. As for A. C. Bradley, that great and honest critic would be the first to welcome fresh insights that have been won since his day. He failed to perceive that "waste" is *most* tragic when caused by human pride and that pride, more than jealousy, brings about Othello's downfall. This matter is fully treated in my new book *Flaming Minister,* issued in England by the Cambridge University Press. Let me challenge Dr Byles to read its final chapter and then write to me direct (thus saving your valuable space) if he still deems my view of the Catastrophe "incredible".

Yours faithfully,
G. R. ELLIOTT.

CHAPEL HILL,
N.C., U.S.A.

P.S.—May I point out that in line 30 of p. 462 in the December number of THEOLOGY the reading should be: "unless he had inwardly accepted the orthodox faith".

NEED LOW MASS BE SO LOW?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Surely one of the most obvious ways of making a "plain" celebration of Holy Communion more corporate is to ask the congregation to stand for the *Gloria in excelsis,* as the Irish Prayer Book very properly directs. The whole momentum of the service requires it. We find it a vast improvement here.

Yours faithfully,
R. H. PRESTON.

ST ANSELM HALL,
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

THEOLOGY IN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I was most interested to read in your January number the Editorial together with Mr Bussby's letter, having just read Professor Burnaby's Inaugural Lecture.

It is high time that we woke to the fact that one of the greatest opportunities which Christianity has been granted in this country for a long time is the provision for religious teaching made in the 1944 Education Act. If this is to be taken up and fully exploited, it demands an immediate supply of qualified teachers. It is true that much depends in a school on the attitude of the Head (I heard only to-day from one of the ex-pupils of an atheist headmaster of a reputable school whose Divinity teaching consisted entirely of tales of ancient Egypt, designed, apparently, to debunk all religion): but the position is not generally so black. There is, indeed, a minority of Grammar Schools which are making a real effort to give the Divinity the chance it deserves in the curriculum. It is taught along the lines of an Agreed Syllabus (mostly worthy documents whose only fault is that they contain enough material for six periods a week instead of the usual one or two); opportunity is given for boys to offer Scripture as a subject in the G.C.E.; and a few "specialists" follow the Advanced Level course in the VI Form (even including New Testament Greek), which is in every way an admirable introduction for a University course in theology. I understand that the position in girls' schools is generally rather better than in boys'.

There is, however, a large obstacle in our way, and that from a strange quarter. Few headmasters (least of all Classics men) would deny that the favoured position which the Greek and Latin classics hold in some Grammar Schools is directly due to the relatively vast numbers of scholarships in Classics available at Oxford and Cambridge. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, it is impossible for a boy to offer Divinity as a subject for Entrance Scholarship. This at Universities which pride themselves on being places of sound learning and true religion. This at Cambridge, where not so long ago Paley's *Evidences* was a compulsory paper for every entrant. How are the mighty fallen!

If we are serious about religious education, then it is up to the Universities to set a lead, and the older ones might well take note of the developments in some other Universities. And if the Regius Professor at Cambridge really hopes "that in time to come an increasing number of those who are to be teachers and not pastors will choose theology as one of the subjects in which they are to graduate", then let his University offer a practical inducement for the study of Christian theology in schools comparable to that offered in embarrassing abundance to other departments of study.

Yours faithfully,

M. A. H. MELINSKY

(Divinity Master,

Lancaster Royal Grammar School).

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Your editorial on this subject gives rise to the wish that Dr Headlam were still with us to defend (in his forthright style) his view of a theological faculty. Such an *apologia* would make exhilarating reading; Dr Headlam was not only fully convinced of the soundness of his judgment—he proceeded with great vigour to put it into practice. As a member of the Oxford Ordination Course for two years, I feel that it would be dishonouring to the memory of a great teacher to suggest that his reforms had the effect—as far as the students were concerned—of reducing the theological faculty to "a seminary for ordinands". On the contrary, Dr Headlam sometimes displayed an immoderate dislike of seminaries and the seminarist outlook; he was persistent in his encouragement of the average student to read Theology in the University.

It is of course obvious that the function of a theological faculty is not exhausted in the training of ministers of religion; and in this matter it may be that the tradition of Oxford differs from that of Cambridge, but it is difficult, in the light of personal experience, to see why Dr Headlam's view should be regarded as "a gravely mistaken judgment". If the traditional and most rewarding vocation of the theological faculty is belittled and disdained, and the notion grows apace that it should be concerned chiefly with advanced study and research, then we may reach that complete cleavage between the divinity professor and the parochial minister which (it is said) caused Harnack to ask with astonishment at Oxford—Does Driver preach? does Selbie preach?

SEDGEBERROW RECTORY,
EVESHAM.

Yours faithfully,
W. E. J. LINDFIELD.

THEOLOGICAL ISSUES OF CONTRACEPTION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I read with interest Canon Warner's article in your January number; but it appears to me that, in his attempt to justify contraception by "scientific" devices, he is guilty of special pleading.

He argues against the "safe period" on the ground that it places "the relational and unitive expression of mutual love under the constraint of a factor external to itself—the calendar": but seems completely unperturbed by the externality of the possession and use of "scientific contraceptives".

Again, he argues that the use of such devices is comparable to the wearing of glasses or a deaf aid. One wears glasses or a deaf aid to assist defective eye-sight or hearing: and in any case, these do not alter the nature of the act of seeing or hearing itself. The "scientific contraceptive" is certainly not to assist deficiency of any organ; and it does affect the character of the act. Therefore the comparison is irrelevant.

Canon Warner rightly believes that "coitus" within marriage has a sacramental character: but he appears to overlook the fact that in the sacraments the outward sign is, and must be, aesthetically satisfying and symbolically suggestive of the end realized. That could hardly be maintained in the case of intercourse in the conditions imposed by the use of "scientific contraceptives".

Yours sincerely,

THE VICARAGE,
WITHERNSEA.

J. EAVES TINSLEY.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NAZARENE GOSPEL RESTORED. By Robert Graves and Joshua Podro. Cassell. £3 3s.

Anyone hoping from the title of this book to find the text of the "Gospel of the Nazarenes" or "according to the Hebrews" will be disappointed. Here is once more the old contrast made by "amateurs and irregulars" (p. xxii) between the "simple" teaching of Jesus the Nazarene and the "perverted" teaching about Christ by later followers, especially Paul (about whom the authors can find no good thing to say), who deified him. It is assumed here that there was an oral tradition of Oracles which after a generation "were surreptitiously jotted down and translated by Greek-speaking converts. Several Greek lives of Jesus, published towards the end of the first century for the various Gentile churches in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor and Greece, were based on such collections of Oracles. According to Luke 1. 1–4 the handling of this pirated material varied greatly. An unbridgeable gulf now separated the original Church of Jerusalem from the Gentile Churches. . . . Not before the mid-second century were *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke* collated, and some clumsy attempts made to reconcile the divergencies" (p. 831). Much to the surprise of anyone who has studied the problem of the dates of the Gospels, we learn that "the four Canonical Gospels developed by accretion until about 130 A.D." (p. 39): the authors think that none of the Gospels, canonical or uncanonical, has been written by the author to whom it is ascribed (p. xi); though why the Church should have picked on Mark and Luke as Evangelists if they were not, is not explained. The methods and conclusions of the most extreme Form-critics are nothing to those of the two writers of this work; more modernist than the most unitarian-sounding modernist, they quote with appreciation an utterance of a Modernist to support their views (p. xxi).

Jesus, we learn, was a devout Jew, belonging to a small apocalyptic sect known as "Zophim" or "Watchers for the Kingdom" and organized on Free Essene lines. While the original Nazarene gospel was "terse, factually accurate and intellectually satisfying . . . Gentile heretics pirated it, mistranslated it into pedestrian Greek, and then subjected it to a century-long process of emendation and manipulation". The authors give two lists of instances of "editorial carelessness and doctrinal piety or perversity" which read more like propa-

ganda than argument and which may be offensive to Christian scholars: the second list includes "identification of Jesus with the second person of the Gnostic Trinity" (p. xiii), though there is no reference to what the "Gnostic Trinity" was or any proof that if it existed it was more than a triad. It is not explained why if Jesus was no more than a misunderstood Pharisee anyone should have troubled to crucify him . . . but we learn (p. 17) that he survived the crucifixion and after a decisive farewell walked up the Mount of Olives until he disappeared into cloud or "departed into the land of Nod" (pp. 997 ff.). So far from subscribing, as many scholars do, to the views of Dr C. H. Dodd about the contents of the primitive Apostolic Preaching, the two authors take a view diametrically opposed to the modern one that, in even the earliest Gospel strata, theology and history are interwoven; still less would they admit that Jesus was worshipped as Maran, our Lord, from the days of the primitive Aramaic-speaking Christian community. With their assumptions the authors find editorial guile everywhere in the Gospels; for instance, the "original" Parable of the Good Samaritan was a "moral story in conventional Pharisaic style about a Priest, a Levite, and a Son of Israel, who found a *Samaritan* lying naked and wounded by the roadside, to whom the Son of Israel showed mercy"; the editorial perversity is ascribed to anti-Pharisaic obsession.

One looks in vain for an explanation of the evidence for the Tomb having been found empty, for the appearances of the Risen Lord and for the rise and growth of the Christian Church.

A large part of the book is taken up with excerpts from the four Gospels, the Talmud, the Apocryphal Gospels and the Logia, all of which are put on the same level and treated as of equal value as evidence for the first century of our era. The reviewer may be dismissed by the authors as one of those "whose livelihood depends on a careful observance of theological etiquette" (p. xxii), but he doubts whether the claim advanced will ever be justified that "the Protestant churches may be reluctant at first" to acknowledge the importance of their researches but will "before long be pressed by their own scholars to make a historic decision: whether they owe allegiance to Jesus himself and his discredited Disciples or to the renegade editors who have deliberately presented the Gospel message". But let the two authors have the last word (p. xvi): "If these findings are to be accepted, historically-minded Protestants will conclude that only one honest course is left to them: namely, to revive Jesus' own form of Judaism and subject themselves to circumcision and the law of ritual cleanliness in token of their sincerity."

Merton College,
Oxford. C. S. C. Williams.

The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church. By Arnold Ehrhardt. Lutterworth Press. 16s.

This book is a testimony to the fresh interest that has arisen to-day concerning the fact and meaning of Apostolic Succession, following the publication in 1946, in time for the Lambeth Conference, of a

large volume entitled *The Apostolic Ministry*. Dr. Ehrhardt has come to the conclusion that the argument of this symposium is unsatisfactory, and his book begins by stating reasons for this belief, which many will read with assent. But he does not, on that account, reject altogether the concept "Apostolic Succession"; rather, he puts forward a novel theory: "the doctrine of the Apostolic succession was formed of two elements, one being the idea of a succession in the ancient priesthood of Israel, the other the idea of succession to the traditions of the Apostolic teaching. Only in so far as the former is concerned can a laying on of hands be made probable. In that sense there is reason to believe that this practice was continued in the Church of Jerusalem, and from there may have spread to other Churches. The persons who performed this ceremony were, at first, the presbyters." Christian priests were regarded as the successors of the Jewish priests, and (perhaps later) the bishop as the successor of the high priest of Israel. "The Apostolic ministry signified, as it does to-day, that the Christian Church was indeed the true Israel of God."

All this is highly controversial; but if the present reviewer finds it somewhat difficult to follow the argument and the steps taken by Dr Ehrhardt to support his case, he hopes that the hesitation he has found will not deter readers of THEOLOGY from studying this interesting book for themselves.

As Lightfoot saw nearly ninety years ago, James the Lord's brother and his position in the Church of Jerusalem probably had a formative influence on the subsequent development of the Christian ministry. It is good, then, that Dr Ehrhardt focuses our attention on this quarter once again; and since in the view of Hegesippus James was "the only one who had the right of entering the Holy Place", some sort of relationship between James and the old Church of Israel is suggested. It is going too far, however, to say that James was the *successor* of the High Priest, and it does not follow that even if subsequently succession lists were suggested in form by the succession lists of Jewish High Priests, the Christian office was regarded as replacing or succeeding to the Jewish. The reference on p. 27 to *Hebrews* is unfortunate, since the object of that Epistle is to maintain the uniqueness of the high priesthood of Christ. Further, there is the fact that the terms *arch-hiereus* and *hiereus* applied to Christian ministers do not emerge until about the year 200. It is to be noted, also, that neither Clement of Rome nor Irenaeus, both of whom refer in different ways to "succession", mentions James at all. And *1 Clem.* 43 does not imply, *pace* Dr Ehrhardt, that the ministry of the Church was the continuation of that of the priests and levites of Israel: the argument is based on analogy, not on identification. *1 Clem.* 44. 3 does not say "ordained" (p. 77), but "appointed" by the Apostles; and similarly in the reference to Acts 14. 23 on p. 34 we should read "appointed" not "ordained".

The book concludes with an interesting chapter on "The Succession at Alexandria and Origen", in which, however, as the author notes, he was unable to make full use of the valuable article by Dr

Telfer in the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. This and an article in the same Journal by E. Molland on succession in Irenaeus will provoke, as Dr Ehrhardt's book does, lively discussion on what, in the ecumenical movement, must be a burning topic. The question may perhaps be put in this way. In these early writers does the term "apostolic succession" or its equivalent mean simply that as an historical fact one leader succeeded another in a particular church from the days of the apostles? Or does it also include one or both of the following ideas: (*a*) a succession in teaching chairs, (*b*) a laying on of hands as an indispensable part of the transmission of the succession, and, if so, by whom performed?

J. E. L. Oulton.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

A Theology of Salvation. By Ulrich E. Simon. S.P.C.K., 25s.

"The intensity of the word overshadows its reasonableness; one feels somehow that the words themselves impart unending energy to the listener" (p. 24). With some qualification of the latter sentiment, Mr Simon's description of Deutero-Isaiah may serve as a broad evaluation of his commentary on these sixteen chapters. As a *theological* commentary, it claims to abandon the arid historical pursuits of traditional English scholarship and to make the Hebrew text "speak Christian theology" (p. 12). It is therefore surprising that the author should take a stand on the historical issue and plump for Torrey's dating (about 400 B.C.) and even more surprising that references to the New Testament should occupy so little space in the bibical index. Paradoxically, there is too much ill-documented technical discussion for the scholar (the book is haunted by the unlaid ghost of Cyrus), and not enough lucid theological exposition for the Christian layman.

The chief (and great) merit of the book is its ebulliency. Mr Simon is obviously intoxicated by the exciting complexity of biblical exegesis (for he is no naïve disciple of Wilhelm Vischer) and in his enthusiasm makes some good observations on (for example) the interpretation of prophetic poetry (pp. 6, 18 f.), the use of analogy (pp. 55–62) and the distinction between typology and allegory (pp. 31, 145 f.). A more sober approach, however, would not only have excluded a great deal of flamboyant repetitiousness (for the author follows his prophetic master, who, he avers, "need not avoid repetitions; on the contrary, he loves them and uses them lavishly. He shirks neither exaggerations nor understatements if they serve his inspired purpose" (p. 24)) but also have drawn a firmer line between paradox and confusion of thought.

In one sentence, we are told that we do not "control the Word by any technique whatsoever"; in the next that the (liberal) critical method is here "harnessed to dogmatic orthodoxy" (p. 5). Do these chapters entirely transcend the personality of their author (p. 14), or do they show him to be "aware of his own genius" (p. 17) and

include a verse (41. 28) which is "as autobiographical as anything in prophetic literature" (p. 81)? Is the alleged "sermon" form of the prophecy the "only fitting and possible form" (p. 19), or *might* he have chosen another (p. 22)? Did the author ever imitate pagan forms (p. 148; cf. p. 174 f.), or is the very idea absurd (p. 136, n. 2)? Is the prophecy "nothing if not a universal proclamation", catering for all men (p. 3), or was it read to a community, whose "training cannot have been negligible" (p. 21) and appropriated by "a very peculiar and highly developed spiritual society" (p. 221)? Was the author deliberately attacking the "paganism of the Greek world" (p. 16)? If so, where is the evidence and where are the references in the subject index?

This lamentable looseness is observable in the footnotes and index (which lack both accuracy and consistency in their references to the names and initials of authors and the dates of their works, e.g. pp. 19, 79, 141), but, more seriously, it affects the writer's use of the critical word "Messiah", despite his recognition that "the whole of the Old Testament makes but sparing and somewhat cautious use of Messianic terminology" (p. 121). Even in this "post-liberal era", it simply will not do to refer to "the Messiah-Child in the early chapters of the first Isaiah" (p. 129; cf. p. 123), as if its theological convenience obviated the need for discussion and documentation.

Despite these many glaring weaknesses, it may fairly be said that Mr Simon has made out a strong case for his assertion that Isaiah 40–55 demands treatment as a theological unity. In some of his broad contentions, the present reviewer finds him more illuminating than misleading, but it is a pity that the wood is almost impossible to discern for luxuriant undergrowth and half-felled trees. If the book is widely read, it may encourage a disciplined scholar possessing theological acumen to undertake the task which Mr Simon has shown to be important.

E. W. Heaton.

Salisbury.

The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. By Roland H. Bainton. Hodder and Stoughton. 20s.

The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne. By Albert Peel and L. H. Carlson. (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts. Volume II.) Allen and Unwin. 35s.

The Reformation continues to attract the attention of scholars, alike in its general historical aspects and in its specialized interests; and the two volumes before us illustrate each of these fields of studies. Professor Bainton is well known as one of the leading authorities on Luther, whose recent biography of the German reformer, *Here I Stand*, is now followed by a series of general lectures, interpretative of the several strands which composed the religious movements of the sixteenth century. In this volume he addresses himself to the general reader, who wishes to know the significance of the various tendencies and to understand their differences and

divergencies, rather than to be overwhelmed by a mass of detail. Professor Bainton therefore is sparing of such detail; probably too sparing for the reader who has not a fairly good acquaintance with the history of the Reformation. Of his thirteen chapters, four are devoted to Luther and Lutheranism; one to Zwingli and Zürich; two to Calvin and the churches deriving from his teaching; one to Anglicanism; one to Anabaptism; one to "the free spirits" who found a resting place in none of the organized churches; and three to the more general issues of religious liberty, the political, and the social relations of the religious movements.

It will be seen therefore that Professor Bainton has drawn his picture in bold, general colours on a large canvas. It is perhaps natural and to be expected that he should be at his best on Luther He insists that Luther's protest was religious and doctrinal. "Not the abuses of medieval Catholicism, but Catholicism itself as an abuse of the Gospel was the object of his onslaught"; and again, "The quarrel was basically religious because Martin Luther was above all else a man of religion". Detailed examples and illustrations are given in plenitude; and Professor Bainton makes clear also how Luther parted from humanism and the humanists, namely on their differing doctrines of Man. Lutheranism however was not a democratic form of Christianity. Indeed it "became and remained democratic only in song"; though at the same time it was the parent of Protestant individualism. The marriage of Protestantism with democracy might have been celebrated at Zürich, had Zwingli not died prematurely. With his death the centre of Swiss Protestantism moved to Geneva; and Professor Bainton does full justice to Calvin and Calvinism. "The *Institutes* of John Calvin set forth a view of God, man, and the church which goes far to explain why Calvinism should have been the most active variety of Protestantism. The drive of Calvinism stems from optimism as to God despite pessimism as to man." Professor Bainton interprets sympathetically the tenets of the Anabaptists, testifying to their puritanism in morals and their championship of religious liberty in an age antipathetic to such an idea. A later chapter traces the development of this principle, despite unfavourable circumstances. The "way of comprehension" has "its most perfect exemplification" in the Anglican religious settlement, of which Professor Bainton writes carefully if not enthusiastically. Finally, he demolishes some hoary fictions and prejudices concerning the relationship of Protestantism to contemporary social and economic developments.

It is evident therefore that this book will appeal most to readers already possessed of a sufficient grounding in history to bear with the comparative absence of dates and the predominance of interpretation over fact. They too will be less disturbed by the author's surprising and not altogether infrequent lapses in matters of fact. Thus it will surprise Anglicans to be assured twice that Cranmer was "consecrated by the pope"; or that it was the *first* Edwardine Prayer Book of 1549 which Calvin found so full of "tolerable ineptitudes"; or that Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* "dealt not with theology but

with church government"; and members of the Church of Scotland may learn with surprise that "the reformation in Scotland is associated with the name of one man, John Knox"; after whose work "Scotch and Presbyterian have never since been dissociated"; for apart from the strangeness of the omission of all mention of Andrew Melville, the vicissitudes of Scottish ecclesiastical history during the century from 1558 to 1662 are not so simply explained. But notwithstanding these minor slips, Professor Bainton's book will be read with profit and pleasure by all students of the Reformation. It is a marvel of comprehension; and its text is admirably diversified and enriched by the series of illustrations from contemporary woodcuts.

The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne is a volume of altogether different character, representing the second milestone on the road towards the realization of the late Dr Albert Peel's ambitious project of a corpus of the Fathers of Nonconformity in England. The lamented death of Peel has thrown the responsibility of continuing and completing his work on Professor Leland H. Carlson, who has contributed the historical-biographical Introduction on Harrison and Browne. The result is a volume which will be indispensable to all serious students of the ecclesiastical history of the reign of Elizabeth I. Amongst the works of Harrison here printed are the "Treatise of the Church and the Kingdome of Christ" and the "Little Treatise upon the firste Verse of the 122 Psalm, Stirring up unto carefull desiring and dutifull labouring for true church Government". Browne is represented particularly by the trilogy of 1582, upon which his fame chiefly rests: the "Treatise of Reformation without tarrying for anie", the "Treatise upon the 23 of Matthewe", and the "Booke which sheweth the life and manners of all true Christians". Scholars have long desired an accurate reprint of these tracts; and this volume has met the need. But if Browne's reputation as a theorist rests upon these works, he was less successful in putting theories into practice. Harrison and Browne differed in opinion to such an extent that dissensions wrecked the unity of their religious experiments; and schism rent their church. "A True and Short Declaration" of 1584, here reprinted, gives the fragment written by Browne to account for these distressing events. On the other hand, the rise of Independency with its democratic church government, its repudiation of all authority of the secular power in matters of religion, and its principle of reformation without tarrying for anie, alarmed the Presbyterians; and Thomas Cartwright became as anxious to dissociate himself from such extreme positions as he had been in his earlier years to criticize the established church in England. Accordingly Browne wrote "An Answere to Master Cartwright, His Letter for Joyning with the English Churches", which is also printed in this volume. From this brief conspectus, it will be evident how great is the debt of historical students to Peel and Carlson. The Halley Stewart Trust, who have sponsored the publication of this series financially, deserve the thanks, together with the editors, of all who are interested in the religious and ecclesiastical history of England during the latter half

of the sixteenth century for the volume now published; and for the prospect of the completion of the task to which Peel had set his hand. It is impossible to overstate the value of such a volume or the services of editor and publisher.

CAMBRIDGE. NORMAN SYKES.

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CLERGY 1800–1900. By C. K. Francis Brown. Faith Press. 17s. 6d.

The preface to this survey will remind the reader of Graham Wallas's introduction to Halévy. There was then (1924), he said, still no scientific history of either the Dissenting sects or of the Church of England. "The histories of nineteenth-century religion are partisan compilations or chatter about Newman." Some part at least of the mantle of M. Halévy has fallen upon Dr Brown—though not as we think the whole garment. Of his industry in accumulating his material there is proof on every page and not a paragraph lacking some pointed anecdote or statistical fact which the student of the period or the theme would wish to hold in memory. Ample use appears to have been made of *Hansard* and the Parliamentary Papers, especially in relation to the crucial foundation of the Ecclesiastical Commission and of the Commissioners' subsequent Reports; a plenitude of reference is provided to the vast mass of biographical and autobiographical literature and to periodicals over at least two-thirds of the century. Particularly pleasing is the use made of the Oxford Diocesan archives in the Bodleian, which include the parochial memoranda of Bishop S. Wilberforce. Some most interesting tables on a variety of topics enable the student to grasp at a glance the concrete significance of that complex process too often and too glibly covered by the caption "the Reform of the Church". The note on the revenues of the Durham Chapter provides the material for a swift appraisal of the depth to which unreformed institutions can drag down the individual beneficiary to acquiescence in the indefensible. And so on. The main weight of the survey lies in its fully documented treatment of the first decade or two after 1832.

The second half of the century receives less detailed treatment, and there are signs here that the mass of the available material was escaping the author's control. Too many aspects—from Christian Socialism to hymnody and clerical cricket—are introduced for justice to be done to any. The author would perhaps have been better advised to have omitted entirely the whole of Book IV or at least the half thereof on "The Clergy in Fiction", of which both the substance and the treatment are inevitably suspect in the eyes of the serious ecclesiastical historian. With the freedom of manœuvre thus gained Dr Brown could have incorporated in the text much of the interesting illustrations now given in footnotes which sometimes occupy a half or more of successive pages. Resolution in the excision of illustrative anecdotes would have allowed scope for the elucidation of one or two disputable theories or inadequately buttressed theses. As it is the author is in danger of not seeing the wood for the trees.

Is it, for instance, even an approximation to the total truth to say that "the most potent factor in reform was the influence of the Tractarians"? That thesis is frequently asserted and often accepted, but if the Victorian ecclesiastical scene is viewed steadily and as a whole, does not a quite different diagnosis emerge? "Tractarianism" has of course various connotations; the eye no doubt sees what it is looking for and the pen can then discourse on "diffused" influence to be found "in the most unlikely places". But without pitting Evangelical against Tractarian or, for that matter, without putting in a claim on behalf of the Broad or (after 1850) the rising Liberal school, we fancy that if Dr Brown will run over the names of his own shining exemplars of the pastoral calling he will agree that by no means all adopted or even tolerated either the theory or the practice of the Oxford school. If R. W. Church (d. 1890) put in nearly twenty years among his two hundred parisioners at Whatley in Somerset, what of J. C. Atkinson (d. 1901) and his fifty years and his 150,000 miles on foot up and down the dales of Danby in Cleveland? Of him Mrs J. R. Green finely said, "His parish sent him to his books and his books again to his parish." But those books were not manuals of ecclesiological controversy. To speak the truth, it was only rarely that "sacred study" provided the prime motive in a thousand parishes up and down the land whereby some ground previously lost to the Methodists (and to the devil) was recovered for the Church. Other and simpler but not therefore less honourable motives more often account for the good works of restoration in worship and fabric and finance.

Nor was Tractarianism the most potent influence among those reforming prelates from Burgess of Salisbury through Blomfield of London to Fraser of Manchester, through whose vision and wisdom and administrative toil the whole complex process of reform and reorganization reached a stage whence further advance would be made possible. From 1856 "Palmerston's bishops" were certainly not Tractarian; nor, later, were Disraeli's; and if Gladstone reckoned eleven of his thirty appointments as "high" and nineteen not so high he always preferred his "high" to be also "broad". Then there were the prelates of the Cambridge Movement, culminating in the episcopates of Lightfoot, Westcott and Benson.

What Warre Cornish calls "the quiet agencies of the Evangelicals" —the C.M.S. and the C.C.C.S., the C.P.A.S., and many less notable— undoubtedly contributed infinitely more in a peaceful way to the progress of real religion and sound churchmanship than all the advances in a Catholic direction (gratifying as these were to minds of a certain temperament), especially where they could be had without riot or quiet secession. And so in pursuit of the total truth the inquirer might proceed to examine other typical categories of reformers—the squire, the schoolmaster, the stolid churchwarden, the retired officer or official—and other aspects of the general revival. No doubt here and there some individual or some new feature of parochial or diocesan life was tinctured by the spirit of the *Christian Year* or stirred by the residual influence of some Catholic teacher or

rector remembered over the years, but it was the beauty of the book or of the life and ministry rather than any specifically Tractarian element which provoked the rural incumbent to love and good works as he began his own independent ministry. Evaluations of influence, religious, political or cultural, are proverbially delicate and not to be made without long and patient toil. Dr Brown himself suggests one method by his own industrious compilation of a list of the clergy between 1800 and 1930 from the *Dictionary of National Biography*. There must be over a thousand names. It would be an interesting exercise to go through these twenty columns noting the school or party, High or Low or Broad, to which each might be allocated. Two results, it is safe to surmise, would follow: first, against the great majority it would be difficult if not impossible to affix any label at all—unless it were C for Central; secondly, the T for Tractarian would be rare. But if an historian fond of drudgery should ever undertake that exercise he should arm himself with oft remembrance of the apostolic injunction: to consider one another not in strife and envy but in that charity which provokes to good works.

BRITFORD. W. G. ADDISON.

THE ENGLISH RELIGIOUS TRADITION. By Norman Sykes. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The difficulty of writing a small book on a great subject which shall be alike instructive, interesting, and encouraging to further study, is notorious. And when the small book is made up of a series of broadcast talks that difficulty, as experience has often shown, is considerably increased. It should be said at once that Professor Sykes has triumphantly overcome it. His little book is full of life and energy; it contains a great deal of well-chosen and well-ordered information without ever loading the reader's mind with too heavy a burden; it fulfils the wide promise of its title and really does succeed in delineating the character of a religious tradition in its most notable aspects; and despite its brevity—there are little more than a hundred pages—the author succeeds in avoiding any sense of undue compression and is able to expatiate when need arises. It is true that he passes with great rapidity through the medieval centuries, yet even here he indicates the outstanding features and effectively sketches the background of his picture, and after all he is plainly right, when working on so small a scale, to give preponderant space to those later centuries in which the English religious tradition developed its special shape and tendencies. The book can be read with profit and enjoyment both by any intelligent beginner and by those who already know a good deal about its subject.

A reviewer cannot, I think, find much here to question on points of fact. It is implied (p. 14) that the Wyclifite translation of the Bible was the work of Wyclif himself: this is generally held to be more than doubtful. Cosin was never Dean of Durham: the reference to him on p. 40 would suggest that he was; but it was as a Canon there

that he encouraged "ornate and splendid ceremonial": his Deanery was of Peterborough (from 1640). "Samson Agonistes" is wrongly entitled an epic (p. 47), and the Disruption of the Scottish Kirk is dated—probably by a misprint—1834 instead of 1843 (p. 87). I have noted only one other misprint ("montheism" for "monotheism", p. 95). These are but minor matters, and it is only very rarely that one is inclined to suggest that Professor Sykes may leave a little too much to the understanding of the non-theological reader: does such a reader know what is meant (p. 21) by the "receptionist doctrine" of the Eucharist?

It is more profitable and more important to emphasize the many excellencies of his work. Among the first of these should be placed the wide and understanding sympathy with which he treats diverse expressions of our religious tradition in Anglicanism, Puritanism, and Roman Catholicism alike. The "story of heroism, pathos, and schism", in Chapter 8 on the Roman Catholics is an admirable illustration of this, incorporating a concise account of persons and events often too little remembered. The treatment of the Westminster Assembly, of the results of the Commonwealth period, and of the critical years 1662 and 1689, is admirably clear and vigorous. Evangelicalism and its influence on religion and society are given their due and significant place in our history. A few lines (p. 66) on the importance of the "discovery of incandescent gas as a means of illumination" afford a good example of the author's eye for significant detail: there will be many readers who were unaware of the connexion of this with Wesley's introduction of Sunday evening services during autumn and winter. A capital chapter on the Oxford Movement is rounded off by a pregnant quotation from Mandell Creighton. And throughout, it is hardly necessary to say, Professor Sykes shows his mastery of new knowledge: a few lines (p. 26) set out the importance of Professor Neale's recent researches on Queen Elizabeth's first parliament in 1559. For all this and much else the author has deserved the gratitude of all who are interested in a great subject.

ALWYN WINTON:

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S DOCTRINE ON HOLY SCRIPTURE. By Jaak Seynaeve, W.F., S.T.D. Publications universitaires de Louvain and Basil Blackwell, Oxford. £3 3s. sewn; £3 10s. bound.

This dissertation by Father Seynaeve on Newman and the Bible fills a gap in our knowledge of Newman's religious thinking, the more so as the author provides us not only with an accurate analysis and useful commentaries, but also with 150 pages of fresh material, consisting of various essays by Newman practically unknown until now. The influences which were felt by Newman (whether they were accepted or more or less strongly opposed) are more carefully studied than they have ever been before. It stands out clearly from this study that Newman, even if he cannot be said to have brought much of his own to the field of scientific inquiry about the Bible, was far from being merely or stubbornly ignorant of the problems that were being

discussed in his time. The contrary assumption which is usually made rests on Bremond's word.

On the problem of what is called Biblical inerrancy, it is commonly held that Newman himself, from a Catholic point of view, seriously erred in his theory of *obiter dicta*. But Father Seynaeve in making clearer what he meant by this makes also much more dubious the so-called heterodoxy of his position. The white-washing that is now so easily applied to all difficulties in that field by means of the "tarte-à-la-créme" of literary forms is only a still looser way of expressing what Newman intended to convey.

On the subject of Newman's hermeneutics, Father Seynaeve's contribution seems richer. He convincingly shows how Newman, better than any of his contemporaries (Keble included), revived and adapted not only mechanical ways of interpretation derived from the Fathers, but their living view of the whole of the Bible as of a single pattern gradually and, as it were, organically disclosing itself through history. It is thus that his (and their) mystical interpretation can best be understood.

Our only criticism of Father Seynaeve's treatment is the too systematic manner in which he has handled his material. Newman is the least systematic of thinkers, and nowhere less than in a field such as the Biblical one can he be rightly apprehended when too much emphasis has been put on the abstract side of the questions. The permanent significance of the great Biblical personalities, the lasting teaching that is to be got for the Church from God's dealings with his people, the way in which our Lord's figure is brought to our apprehension through the whole Bible—what Newman has to say about these and similar themes is much more illuminating than his academic discussion of interpretation in the abstract. Father Seynaeve evidently has a certain feeling that that is so; it is a pity that he did not give more weight to it in planning his book.

Some misprints or mistakes mar a volume which is on the whole very carefully produced. To speak only of what concerns the present writer, I have never written the sentence quoted p. 23, n. 1: "... Mais où son pessimisme n'est pas *viable*, etc.", but: ". . . Mais où son pessimisme n'est pas *niable*, etc." Other similar errors which may easily mystify the average reader will have to be expunged if there is a new edition.

Louis Bouyer.

Paris.

Poets and Mystics. By E. I. Watkin. Sheed and Ward. 21s.

The chapters of this book are in effect separate essays, loosely connected by certain common themes. They vary not only in subject-matter but in quality, for Mr Watkin is, I believe, a valuable guide to the history and theology of mystical devotion but an uncertain theorizer on the nature and technique of poetry. The intending reader must not judge the quality of the book by its earlier pages; it would be a better and more homogeneous work if the first three

chapters were omitted. Chapter I on "Poetry and Mysticism" and Chapter III on "Drama and Religion" are dubious in their treatment of poetry and drama. Chapter II should certainly not have been written at all. It endeavours to maintain that Shakespeare, though a great poet, was only "mediocre" as a man and that, correspondingly, his plays are magnificent while inspiration continues but "sad stuff" when it flags, since he "cherished ambitions other than artistic perfection" and in his less inspired moments was aiming at material, not aesthetic, success. In fairness to Mr Watkin's book, so admirable in many respects, I must resist the temptation to answer the specific charges in this arraignment of Shakespeare for "lack of artistic conscience". They are based on old errors long since disproved (e.g. that no care was taken over his published text), opinions now largely discredited (e.g. that he "botched" other men's plays), and a failure to recognize the conventions of Elizabethan theatre and the commonplaces of Elizabethan thought. It would appear that Mr Watkin is ignorant of much of the last twenty years of Shakespearian scholarship. This is unfortunate, for he would surely welcome the many works, not all of them by churchmen, which interpret the plays as profoundly Christian. (The scene in *Macbeth* which, following older critics, he regards as a mere copy of Holinshed contains, as I have shown elsewhere, no less than twelve important religious references not one of which is in the original.) Mr Watkin is on surer ground with devotional poetry, though he examines the nature of the devotion rather than the quality of the poetry. He writes interestingly on Vaughan's Hermeticism and on the peculiarly "baroque" devotion of Crashaw, but fails to note the importance of "metaphysical wit", which is a mode of thought and a discipline common to both poets. The essay on William Crashaw, Richard's father, is especially important to the scholar, since it points out that, although anti-Romanist, William was no Puritan, as has been believed, but was probably similar in doctrine to and in personal contact with the devotees at Little Gidding: this casts a new light on the poet's upbringing. There is also a useful appreciation of the poetry of Miss Ruth Pitter. The remaining essays deal with mystical and devotional writers and clearly come more within the range of Mr Watkin's special competence. There is an admirable and penetrating study of Dame Julian of Norwich and it is followed by a judicious but spirited defence of Margery Kempe. The longest chapter provides a critical analysis of the teaching of Dom Augustine Baker; the technical study of mysticism is closest here, but the theology is more profound in the essay on Dame Julian. The Puritan Goodwin, who wrote a devotional work on the Sacred Heart before the Continental development of the cultus, and the Cambridge Platonist John Smith, are each the subject of an essay; so is the modern Roman Catholic Sister Elizabeth of the Trinity. Whatever the contrasts in method or degree of attainment, the underlying teaching of all, mystics and devotional poets, is the same: that the soul is forever held in the love of God and that this is the all-important and overmastering fact. The author's own comments are

eminently wise. All, he says, are called to unitive prayer, but "since the contemplative aspect of this unitive prayer, the intuition of the union, is accidental and dependent on factors other than the union itself, all are not called to it but many, perhaps most, can and must possess the union with little or no consciousness of it". The special techniques of mysticism, I take this to mean, are for those who have a special awareness of their spiritual states and are called to use this awareness as the means to their attainment of union with God. But union with God is the proper end of all men, whether awareness goes with it or not, and is attainable by the faithful in any virtuous calling.

S. L. Bethell.

Cardiff.

The Christian Approach to Culture. By Emile Cailliet. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $3.75.

In this "Christian" approach to culture, the author does not intend to consider "what happened when Christianity came to grips with the secular order". Rather, he wishes "to view cultural manifestations with Christian eyes". By Christianity in this context, Cailliet means "evangelical Christianity", which is defined in a statement which was adopted by the Reformed Church of France in 1938 (pp. 47–8). Cailliet admits that evangelical Christianity has always entertained a deep-seated prejudice against "secular" culture in general and science in particular. This prejudice was normally expressed in an opposition to philosophy as such, e.g. by Tertullian, Bernard of Clairvaux, and the Reformers. It should be stressed, however, that this tendency does not reflect the outlook of the Church as a whole. According to Cailliet, the great apostles of a "Christian culture" were guilty of "ontological deviationism". They were guilty of idolizing certain concepts which afforded them only some measure of understanding of nature.

This theme is illustrated in a sweeping survey of the progress of science from the days of the Greeks to date. Thus, following Aristotle, the Schoolmen classified instead of measuring, and the resulting "Aristotelian stagnation" in science lasted until the days of Galileo. Now the Reformation and the advent of modern science are aspects of the same revolt against Scholasticism. Unfortunately the Reformed tradition did not take advantage of its solidarity with the new science, and the result has been a "modern frustration"—man's deeper religious needs remain unsatisfied. In the West, the dominant note is one of pessimism, and this springs from a lack of vision. In the East, there is vision but it is false, namely Communism.

We can escape from this impasse if we adopt the ideal of an intimate association between science and religion. This will result in a revolution in theological outlook. It must be realized, for example, that theology is in an embryonic stage; it has still to achieve a genuine scientific status, and it can only proceed efficiently upon the groundwork laid down by the human sciences. We shall have to

reject the medieval postulate of an "Absolute God", because modern science has taught us that absolutism is a disease. Cailliet goes so far as to say that just as the Planck-Einsteinian view has superseded the Newtonian in physics, so the "divine relativity" view supersedes the Thomist absolutist view in theology. We still need metaphysics, however, and the basis of metaphysics is a doctrine of analogy. Not, however, the Thomist analogy of Being, but an analogy based on "personality".

Space will allow only three comments. The distinction between Christianity and culture is far too facile. Further, granted that the concept of Being is inadequate as a basis for an acceptable doctrine of analogy, is it true that the concept of "personality" is more adequate? Much more needs to be said about it than is said here before an affirmative answer can be given. Finally, the book contains far too many quotations (especially from contemporary writers) which are not very illuminating. A large nmber of phrases, too, require more adequate definition; e.g. under God, modern religious mind, modern philosophy, modern negations, modern science, modern spiritualism, the conscience of our day, the mind of our day, truth to be done.

RONALD TREE.

LAMPETER.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: E. Stanley Jones, *Growing Spiritually* ($1.50).
BLACKWELL: J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals at Oxford 1735–1871* (25s.).
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (for UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS): Pierson Parker, *The Gospel before Mark* (49s.).
CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (15s.).
FABER AND FABER: Frithjof Schuon, *The Transcendent Unity of Religions* (21s.).
HOLLIS AND CARTER: Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England—II* (42s.).
LONGMANS: John R. W. Stott, *Men with a Message* (7s. 6d. and 4s.); Benedict Steuart, *The Development of Christian Worship* (30s.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: J. M. Shaw, *Christian Doctrine—A One Volume Outline of Christian Belief* (30s.); G. W. Bromiley, *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (21s.).
MOWBRAY: H. C. Robins, *A Guide to Spiritual Healing* (7s. 6d.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. N. Stromberg, *Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth Century England* (21s.).
PENGUIN BOOKS: A. C. Bouquet, *Sacred Books of the World* (3s. 6d.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: R. W. Thomson, *How the English Bible Grew* (2s. 6d.).
ROCKLIFF: E. Westacott, *Roger Bacon in Life and Legend* (10s. 6d.).
S.C.M. PRESS: C. H. Dodd, *Three Sermons* (2s.); A. R. Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy: A Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Revolution* (25s.).
S.P.C.K.: R. P. C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* (25s.); W. G. Peck, *A Christian Economy* (17s. 6d.); J. Lawson, *Methodism and Catholicism* (3s. 6d.); H. Northcott, C.R., *Man, God, and Prayer* (9s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher